

CITY OF MUSKEGON
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES

July 10, 2003

P. Sartorius called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m., and roll was taken.

MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Aslakson, P. Sartorius, T. Johnson, B. Smith, T. Michalski, L. Spataro

MEMBERS ABSENT: B. Mazade, excused; S. Warmington, excused; T. Harryman, excused.

STAFF PRESENT: D. Steenhagen, H. Griffith

OTHERS PRESENT: J. Boss, Sterling Group; S. Czadzeck, Driesenga & Associates; T. Miller, MAISD; M. Spaniola, 1129 Third; E. Sherman, 1337 Peck.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of June 12, 2003 and the special meeting of June 25, 2003, was made by T. Johnson, supported by L. Spataro and unanimously approved.

A motion to move Hearing; Case 2003-28 to the beginning of the agenda was made by T. Johnson, supported by J. Aslakson and unanimously approved.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Hearing; Case 2003-28: Request for final Planned Unit Development approval for a senior housing development at McLaren St. and Wesley Ave., by The Sterling Group. D. Steenhagen presented the staff report. The subject property was purchased by Findlay Development in order to build a 40-unit senior residential development. Findlay had obtained tax credits through the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) for the development. Findlay has recently decided not to pursue the project and has been in discussion with Sterling Group about taking over the development. Sterling Group will be purchasing the property and the tax credits from Findlay. There needs to be some form of guarantee, either through the tax credits or other means, that this development will remain a senior complex in perpetuity. Staff has been working with Sterling Group for the past several months on the possible vacation of McLaren St. and other site issues for the property. Two issues remain at this point. The vacation of McLaren St. was tabled by the Planning Commission at their June 25 Special Meeting and needs to be addressed. The final PUD and site plan for the development also needs to be addressed as well. This is an update on the street vacation request: a) A meeting was held on July 1. In attendance were the City Manager, Zoning Administrator, City Engineer, Fire

Marshal, City Attorney and a representative from the Sterling Group. The discussion centered on the issues brought up at the special Planning Commission meeting. b) It was determined that the only portion of street that is absolutely necessary to be vacated is the portion of McLaren, which is south of the proposed Sumner St. extension. Sterling prepared a legal description for that portion of street which was provided to the commission members. The vacation request will only address that description. c) Sterling absolutely requires that the City Commission vacates the portion of street before July 31st or they will not pursue the project. Staff and the Planning Commission are hesitant to vacate a street without some form of guarantee that the project will proceed. A letter was prepared by the City Attorney to Sterling Group giving two different options for vacating the street. The letter was provided to the commission members. d) Staff recommended to the Sterling Group that they contact the Jackson Hill Neighborhood Association and gave contact information for the association. Staff has contacted the Muskegon County Drain Commissioner who has stated that to the best of his knowledge and from what the records in his office show, this area is not a county drain.

Staff has reviewed the submitted final site plan and has the following comments: a) The site plan shows 16 duplex buildings (32 units) and two 4-unit buildings (8 units) for a total of 40 units for the development. There is also a proposed office and clubhouse building. The proposed buildings are situated along the proposed re-aligned McLaren St., and Sumner Ave. and the existing Wesley Ave. b) There are 14 two-bedroom units shown and 26 one-bedroom units. Each unit is proposed to have a one-stall garage with an additional parking space in the driveway in front of the garage. There are three proposed spaces for the office and clubhouse. c) The zoning ordinance requires 15% common, usable open space for a residential development. It is unclear on the proposed plan where the common open space is proposed to be. Since this is a proposed senior complex, it may not be necessary for a full 15% of the property to be open space, but some common, usable open space does need to be provided on the site. d) Setbacks from the property lines are shown, but no proposed setbacks of the structures from the streets (existing or proposed) that they front on are shown. An average of 15 feet is shown for most structures from the property lines, but there is one structure proposed to be 11.1 feet from the eastern property line (building "R"). e) The proposed development is adjacent to several existing single-family residential properties. A minimum four-foot screen is required between a multiple-family development and any adjacent residential properties. A fence, wall or hedge would meet the requirement, as long as it is at least four feet in height and is an effective screen. f) No building dimensions are shown on the site plan. Separate floor plans are provided which do show dimensions of the rooms in the proposed buildings, but the dimensions of each building need to be shown on the site plan as well. Building heights need to be given as well. g) An elevation of a proposed design has been provided. Staff is unsure if each building is proposed to look identical and what the appearance of the two 4-unit buildings is proposed to be. Building designs should be varied and mixed up in order to keep every building from looking exactly the same. At a minimum, varying rooflines, siding colors and window styles should be used. h) There is no information provided as to the existing vegetation on the site. No landscape plan has been provided for the development. All existing trees need to be indicated and clearly marked as to whether they are proposed to be preserved or removed. Existing trees and vegetation need to be retained as much as practical on the site. Staff understands that this may be difficult with the grading changes that need to occur on the site, but existing trees along the rear edges of the buildings (along the property lines) could be preserved. There are many large, mature trees on the site, which would enhance the

development. i) Trees proposed to be preserved need to be clearly marked on site and protected with snow fencing or other means during construction. Any trees approved to be preserved which are later removed during construction must be replaced, as specified in the ordinance, with two trees for every one removed. A performance guarantee for landscaping and tree protection/replacement should be provided by the developer. j) All proposed landscaping for the site needs to be shown on a landscaping plan. The proposed placement, size and species of all proposed landscaping materials need to be shown. Street trees along the proposed Sumner and McLaren Streets should be provided since the grading of this area will most likely require all existing trees to be removed. k) Sidewalk is shown along both sides of most of the proposed McLaren and Sumner Streets as well as the Wesley Ave. cul-de-sac. l) A location for an identification sign is shown on the site plan. Any site signage must meet ordinance requirements for size and placement and sign permits must be obtained at the time that signs are placed on the property. The ordinance permits entranceway monument signs for residential developments of up to 12 square feet. One sign for each major public road frontage may be provided. Signs shall not exceed eight feet in height. m) The Engineering Dept. has reviewed the site plan and has the following comments: i) The construction plans for Sumner and McLaren be submitted and approved by the Engineering Department. ii) Said plans must contain a standard local street dimensions such as width of street a minimum of 27 feet back to back and right-of-way of no less than 50 feet to be dedicated to the City. n) The Fire Marshal has reviewed the site plan and has the following comments: i) Fire hydrants requirements shall comply with the International Fire Code Appendix C. ii) Letter stating that fire suppression will be installed in all structures as agreed by Sterling Group rep. Mr. Boss must be submitted to Fire Marshal before approval is granted. (The Fire Marshal had denied the site plan until the letter was received). n) Staff has not yet received comments from the Department of Public Works but will bring any comments to the meeting. o) The Police Department has reviewed the site plan and has no outstanding issues with it. A floor plan for proposed one and two-bedroom units was provided. Not all room dimensions are shown on the floor plan, and no scale is given. Staff was unable to determine the living space for the proposed units to determine if it will meet ordinance requirements. Since these are senior units, not family units, it may be reasonable to permit them to be slightly smaller than normally required, but staff does need all room dimensions (or a scale drawing) so that the living space can be determined. The ordinance requires storage space of at least 15% of the interior living space of all units, exclusive of auto or attic storage, to be provided. Without room dimensions or a scale drawing, staff cannot be sure, but it does appear that the proposed units will not meet this requirement. Staff has received two phone calls regarding this case, with questions only. The caller indicated that she would be sending a letter regarding her opinion in this case and so far none was received. Selby Walsh stated that he would prefer to keep McLaren as it is, but is okay with having Sumner going through instead of having McLaren dead-end. Staff recommends approval of the request with the conditions.

L. Spataro stated that they should review the PUD first. T. Johnson asked if the Jackson Hill Neighborhood Association had been contacted. D. Steenhagen stated that the applicant was provided with the contacts so they could notify them. We also notify the neighborhood association when there is a case with the same notification letter that goes out to the residents within 300 ft. of the proposed location. T. Johnson asked if everyone had been re-notified about this request. D. Steenhagen stated that she changed the letter to include the PUD and the street

vacation. T. Johnson asked if Sumner was proposed to be a public or private street. D. Steenhagen stated that it was to be public.

J. Boss stated that they are comfortable with the conditions staff has proposed. A representative of Sterling Group had contacted both representatives of the Jackson Hill Neighborhood Association. He hadn't heard any negative responses from either.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by L. Spataro, supported by T. Michalski and unanimously approved.

L. Spataro stated that he wasn't comfortable with approving this at this time. There are too many unaddressed issues. He brought up the project that Sterling Group is doing on the Balcom Cove site. He felt this was misrepresented to everyone. He is concerned that the same will happen with this project. He would prefer that the issues addressed by staff be ironed out and for staff to say they are comfortable that all the issues are resolved before approving it. T. Johnson stated that he also has some reservations with the density of the structures on the site. He is concerned that the structures would be crowded on the site. He would like to know why the structures are so close together. J. Boss stated that they had inherited the tax credits and in order to achieve the tax credits, they are required to have a certain number of units on the site. The market analysis that had been performed showed a need for this type of senior citizen project and that it would be filled. They are required to have the number of units in order to receive the tax credits. P. Sartorius asked if they could lower the number of buildings on the site. J. Boss stated that this decision wouldn't be up to him. They are required to have an approved site plan by July 31st. The Balcom site hasn't received approval for any tax credits yet. They are on their 3rd application. He stated that everything on the site plan for the McLaren St. property is to scale even though the numbers aren't written on the plans. P. Sartorius stated that the elevation heights also weren't provided on the site plan. J. Boss stated that the buildings would be single story duplex and four-plexes with attached garages.

B. Smith arrived at 4:27 p.m.

T. Johnson stated that this seemed to be a tax credit driven theme. He asked if Findlay had seen the site. J. Boss stated that those that he had spoken with had not. There was a topography map provided to them. They wouldn't be building to sell the property. They would be building and then managing the property. D. Steenhagen gave the history behind the Findlay project. They had looked at several pieces of land before this. The person that had been handling this project is no longer with Findlay. He had seen the property. L. Spataro stated that he is worried that the Jackson Hill Neighborhood Association wouldn't be happy since this project is different than the one that Findlay had shown them. He felt that the process for tax credits was done backwards. They should have looked at what would fit appropriately on the property and go with the surrounding neighborhood and then apply for the tax credits. J. Aslakson had concerns with the buildings being 10 ft. apart on the south side of Sumner. The property could support 18 to 20 single-family homes if Sumner went all the way through. P. Sartorius stated that he is surprised that the neighborhood association isn't being vocal with any concerns or support for this project as they have been in the past for other projects. D. Steenhagen stated that the reason Findlay proposed senior housing was because of the marketing strategy for City owned lots that had been completed at the time. The elderly people that lived in the neighborhood wanted to

stay in the neighborhood. P. Sartorius had some concerns that the required 15% common open space won't be met. He asked how much was proposed. D. Steenhagen stated that since this was to be a senior complex, the residents would be less mobile and may be able to have less common open space. J. Boss stated that there would be retaining walls. The residents would be free to go where they please on the site. They would be willing to add a picnic area or what staff and the commission members would like to see. P. Sartorius asked staff if there had been any direct problems with the Balcom site. D. Steenhagen stated that it had been awhile since they've seen anything and once the tax credits are approved, then they would need to submit a new site plan. J. Boss stated that they are willing to do what they were told to do in regards to the Balcom property. The Fire Marshal required all the buildings on the McLaren property to be fire suppressed due to the closeness of the buildings and due to the fact that senior citizens would be residing there. They are willing to do this. P. Sartorius asked if Sumner would be a dedicated ROW. J. Boss stated that it would be. P. Sartorius asked if they would submit the proposed elevations. J. Boss stated that they would do as needed. T. Johnson asked what the square footage of the buildings were. J. Boss stated that they are the same size as what was originally submitted. L. Spataro stated that according to the previous minutes regarding this case, the 1-bedroom units were 720-sq. ft. and the 2 bedroom units were 940 sq. ft. S. Czadzeck stated that was correct. He added that in order for them to have the smaller buildings, the Fire Marshal wanted them fire suppressed. L. Spataro stated that they were to be fire suppressed due to the topography of the property. J. Boss asked the commission members to approve with the conditions and if they can't be met, they will withdraw from this project. T. Johnson stated that the Planning Commission is making a recommendation to the City Commission. The City Commission makes the final decision. They may or may not agree with the Planning Commission's recommendation. B. Smith asked if the commission members were to deny the request, would it die. P. Sartorius stated that it wouldn't die, it would still go before the City Commission. L. Spataro stated that he would prefer to table this request until there is proof that the conditions could be met. He would be willing to have a special meeting in order to try to make the applicant's deadline for the tax credits. J. Boss stated they would have known the concerns, they would have brought something new addressing the concerns. D. Steenhagen asked the applicant if he had received the staff report that had been faxed to him. J. Boss stated that he had not. D. Steenhagen explained to the commission members that staff has started to fax the staff reports this month to the applicants in order to get the information to them quicker.

A motion that the final PUD and associated site plan for a senior residential development at McLaren St., Sumner Ave. and Wesley Ave. be approved pursuant to the determination of compliance with the intent of the City Zoning Ordinance and City Master Land Use Plan based on the following conditions: 1) A guarantee will be provided that the development will remain a senior complex in perpetuity. 2) The proposed vacation of a portion of McLaren St. and the proposed re-alignment of McLaren St. and Sumner Ave. must be approved by the City Commission or this PUD approval will be void. 3) A revised site plan will be submitted for staff's approval and will contain: a) All areas proposed to be usable common open space will be clearly indicated on the site plan. At least 10% of the site must be usable common open space. b) All building setbacks will be shown, including setbacks from the proposed McLaren St. and Sumner Ave. rights-of-way. c) A minimum four-foot screen will be provided between the subject property and all adjacent residential properties. d) Building dimensions for all buildings will be shown on the site plan, including building heights. e) The design of the structures may not be identical for all buildings. Varying rooflines, siding colors or window styles must be

used to create a variety in the building elevations. Elevations for all proposed buildings need to be provided. f) A floorplan for the one-bedroom and two-bedroom units must be provided with all inside room dimensions and must be to scale. g) A landscaping plan for the development must be provided and must include: i) All existing vegetation must be shown on the site plan and clearly marked as to be preserved or to be removed. As many trees as practical must be retained on the site. Trees to be preserved must be marked on site and must be protected during construction by snow fencing or other suitable means. ii) Any trees approved to be preserved which are later removed must be replaced with two trees, according to ordinance requirements. iii) All proposed landscaping needs to be shown, including street trees along McLaren and Sumner Streets. 4) Sign permits will be obtained for all proposed signage and signs will meet ordinance requirements. 5) The construction plans for Sumner and McLaren must be submitted to and approved by the Engineering Department and must contain local street dimensions such as width of street a minimum of 27 feet back-to-back and right-of-way of no less than 50 feet, to be dedicated to the City. 6) Fire hydrants shall comply with International Fire Code Appendix C. 7) Fire suppression will be installed in all structures, and that the vacation of a portion of McLaren St., as described in the attached legal description, be recommended to the City Commission for approval based on the following conditions: 1) All units in the proposed development will be fire suppressed, as agreed to by the Sterling Group in their 7/9/03 letter. 2) The fire hydrants must comply with International Fire Code Appendix C for placement and amount. 3) The effective date of the vacation will be when the following are completed (as agreed to by the Sterling Group in their 7/9/03 letter): a) The pulling of building permits and issuance of certificates of occupancy. b) Plans are presented and approved by City staff for the construction of the proposed Sumner Street and reconstruction of McLaren Street. c) Posting a bond in the amount determined by the City to cover the cost of construction of proposed Sumner Street and reconstruction of McLaren Street north of proposed Sumner. 4) This vacation will reserve unto the City the right to retain and maintain all utilities in the vacated street. 5) A new 8" water main will be installed between Alva St. and the east line of the property owned by Findlay Group. 6) A new 8" water main will be constructed in McLaren St. from the newly proposed street to the north limits of the Findlay Group property. 7) A new street will be constructed and dedicated for public use or an easement provided for the would-be constructed water main. 8) The applicant will participate in the construction of the 8" water main from the north limits of the Findlay Group property to Jackson St. in the amount not more than \$30,000 with the rest of the Cost by the City. 9) The City will not maintain a sewer lift station should the proposed project require a station by design. Maintenance of a sewer lift station either individually or collectively will be the responsibility of the property owner, was made by T. Johnson, supported by B. Smith and discussion continued on the motion.

The commission members discussed the smaller size of the proposed buildings and P. Sartorius would prefer to see the 15% common open space met.

A motion that the street vacation, final PUD and associated site plan for a senior residential development at McLaren St., Sumner Ave. and Wesley Ave. be tabled until a new site plan is submitted with all the dimensions shown, 15% common open space, and the size of the proposed buildings would be to zoning code, was made by L. Spataro, supported by J. Aslakson and unanimously approved.

Hearing; Case 2003-25: Request for a Special Use Permit for a specialized adult education

program at 1115 Third St., by the Muskegon Area Intermediate School District. D. Steenhagen presented the staff report. The property is located at the corner of Third St. and Houston Ave. and is the former Walt Plant building. The Neighborhood Investment Corporation (NIC) has recently purchased the building and is rehabbing it for first-floor offices and second-floor residential. In January of 2002, the MAISD received a Special Use Permit to operate their Adult Community Transitional Program in the basement of the Fifth/Third Bank Building downtown. At this time, they are seeking to expand the program into a portion of the office space being leased by NIC at the subject property. Therefore, they are seeking a special use permit to allow this use there. A description of the Adult Community Transitional Program was provided to the commission members. There is an approved site plan for this property. The proposed use would be located in a portion of the first floor. Three parking spaces have been provided by a shared parking agreement with Catholic Social Services, located on the other side of Houston Ave. from the subject property, well within the 1,000 feet allowed for shared parking. The participants in the program do not require additional parking spaces as they use public transportation only. Staff has received phone calls regarding this case. The first was from Vicky at Mass Mutual. She had questions and no concerns were expressed. The second call was from Karen Kendall who had questions and had no problem with the request. Staff recommends approval of the request with conditions.

P. Sartorius asked if this was the same project with the same conditions as the program at the First St. location. He also asked if staff had received any complaints about the program at the First St. location. D. Steenhagen stated that it is the same project and staff hasn't received any complaints about the program. T. Miller stated that the First St. location is full. They have 15 students at the location. They are expanding and would like to expand to the Third St. location. T. Johnson asked if there would be a need for this to go beyond the proposed hour limitations. T. Miller stated that they may have meetings with parents in the evenings but the program would run only during school hours. T. Johnson stated that he would prefer to not limit the hours of operation. T. Miller stated that the program doesn't have a need to run in the evening. M. Spaniola stated that he liked the renovations that were being done to the property. He is in favor of the request.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by T. Johnson, supported by J. Aslakson and unanimously approved.

T. Johnson stated that he would like to take out the condition of the hours. P. Sartorius suggested changing the limit on the number of students to 15 as the applicant would only have that many students at the location. L. Spataro suggested leaving the number of students at 30. This way if something changes in the future, the applicant wouldn't have to go before the Planning Commission to have the condition changed.

A motion that the special use permit and for a specialized adult education program at 1115 Third St., by the MAISD be approved, based on compliance with the City's Master Land Use Plan and conditions set forth in the City of Muskegon Zoning Ordinance based on the following conditions: 1) No residency will be permitted in the facility, except in the upper floor apartments. 2) No more than 30 students can be associated with the program at this location, was made by J. Aslakson, supported by T. Michalski and unanimously approved.

Hearing; Case 2003-26: Request to amend the Zoning Ordinance to permit tourist homes with more than 2 guest rooms in the RM-1, Low Density Multiple-Family Residential zoning district, by Elizabeth B. Sherman. D. Steenhagen presented the staff report. The applicant has purchased the former Bob Carr's House of Gifts and has converted it into a Tourist Home (Bed & Breakfast). The property is zoned RM-1, Low Density Multiple-Family Residential which allows this use, with up to 2 guestrooms. The applicant would like to add a third guestroom. A definition of Tourist Homes as defined in the Zoning Ordinance was provided to the commission members. Tourist Homes are not considered to be home occupation businesses; in fact they are specifically mentioned under those uses which are prohibited as home occupation businesses: A lodging service including but not limited to, a tourist home, motel or hotel. Tourist Homes are permitted in the RT district under special use permit and in the RM-1 district as a principal permitted use. All RM-1 principal permitted uses are also permitted in the RM-2 and RM-3 districts as well, by reference. The use is not mentioned anywhere else in the ordinance. Therefore, there is no zoning district, which currently permits a tourist home to have more than 2 guestrooms. The proposed definition of Tourist Home was provided to the commission members. Staff has proposed regulations regarding Tourist Homes, which was provided to the commission members. The use would remain as a special use in the RT district and a principal use in the RM-1, RM-2 and RM-3 districts. Staff is also proposing that the use be added to the H district as a special use. Parking requirements for Bed & Breakfast uses are already in place in the parking section of the ordinance. The ordinance requires one paved, off-street parking space for each guest room as well as two spaces for the permanent resident(s).

T. Johnson asked how this hearing was advertised. D. Steenhagen stated that it was advertised as it is shown on the agenda. T. Johnson stated that he didn't believe that they could approve the language in any other district other than what was advertised. D. Steenhagen stated that in the past they have changed it in the zoning districts the language would affect. T. Johnson would like to see the language under item A to be the owner or operator... P. Sartorius would like to see the language changed under item C to be breakfast may be served... J. Aslakson asked where Bed and Breakfasts are allowed. D. Steenhagen stated that Tourist Homes and Bed and Breakfasts have the same meaning and are used interchangeably. D. Steenhagen proposed changing the definition and changing the conditions. P. Sartorius asked since this hearing was listed as RM-1, could it be changed in RT also. T. Johnson stated that unless the conditions are listed in the definition, it couldn't be changed in the RT zoning district without notice. L. Spataro stated that it could be changed in the RT at a later date. They should proceed with this under the RM-1 zoning district. J. Aslakson stated that the proposed changes are also requested for the H zoning district. D. Steenhagen stated that she would re-notice for RT and H zoning districts. E. Sherman gave an explanation as to why her request for this change came about. She would like to have a third bedroom for her bed and breakfast. J. Aslakson would prefer to see either Tourist Homes or Bed and Breakfast be used. He felt it was confusing to use them both if they referred to the use. He would also like to have the word residential added to the definition. He would like to see it read: A use, which is subordinate to the principal residential...

A motion to close the public hearing was made by J. Aslakson, supported by T. Johnson and unanimously approved.

A motion that the proposed amendment regarding Tourist Homes (Bed & Breakfast Facilities)

be recommended for approval to the City Commission with the proposed changes, was made by L. Spataro, supported by T. Michalski and unanimously approved.

Hearing; Case 2003-29: Staff-initiated request to amend Section 2307 (Permitted Yard Encroachments) of the zoning ordinance regarding setbacks for decks. D. Steenhagen presented the staff report. The commission members were provided with the Section 2307 (Permitted Yard Encroachments) from the Zoning Ordinance. The current language is ambiguous. The word “otherwise” is intended to mean that if no established fence line exists then decks under 2 feet above grade must be at least 3 feet from the property line. However, this language could be interpreted to mean that decks over 2 feet above grade can be 3 feet from property lines. The building code treats decks over 2 feet above grade as part of the principal structure and the zoning ordinance should clearly state that they need to meet the same setback requirements as the principal structure (house). The proposed changes and the definitions for deck, patio, and porch were provided to the commission members.

T. Johnson would like the definition of deck to read as follows: A floored structure that adjoins a house. L. Spataro stated that the definition for patio needed to be more specific. He felt this should cover whether or not a vehicle could be parked on the patio. J. Aslakson felt the definition should be left as it is until it becomes an issue. He is concerned if a patio could be covered or uncovered. D. Steenhagen stated that if it is covered, it is a deck. T. Johnson would also like to have the definition for a porch to have “usually” removed and to read as follows: A covered entrance to a building; projecting from the wall.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by J. Aslakson, supported by L. Spataro and unanimously approved.

A motion that the proposed amendments to Article II (Definitions) and Section 2307 (Permitted Yard Encroachments) with the proposed changes be recommended for approval to the City Commission, was made by L. Spataro, supported by T. Johnson and unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS

Case 2003-27: Request for Site Plan Review for a cold storage warehousing and outside storage facility at 715 Access Hwy., by On the Road Again – Motorhead Mall, LLC.

A motion that the request for site plan approval for cold storage warehousing and outdoor storage at 715 Access Hwy. be tabled until an architect-stamped site plan has been approved by the Fire Marshal, was made by J. Aslakson, supported by L. Spataro and unanimously approved.

OTHER

Zoning Educational Materials – D. Steenhagen asked the commission members if they had read over the materials that were mailed to them and if they had any corrections or changes. The commission members felt that the materials were informative.

E-mail of Planning Commission Packets – D. Steenhagen stated that she could now scan attachments into the commission packets. If the commission members were interested, staff could start to e-mail them to the commission members so they would be able to get them quicker. The oversized site plans would still need to be mailed. Most of the ZBA members would be receiving their packets through e-mail. P. Sartorius stated that since their packets are large and a lot of people may have problems opening them especially if there are a lot of graphics in them. The commission members decided to wait and see how it goes for the ZBA.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

hmg
7/10/03